

As Secretary Gates said last fall, “Development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers.”

In places like Haiti and Sudan, we provide assistance not only for purely humanitarian reasons, but also because a failure to do so could lead to chaos and bloodshed that would be far more costly in the long run.

Going back to 2008 levels of global AIDS funding would mean ending antiretroviral treatment for people who are currently receiving it. It would mean abandoning pregnant women who run a high risk of transmitting HIV to their newborns. It would mean fewer orphans and vulnerable children will get care and support, and fewer people in poor countries will get HIV counseling and testing.

President Bush made clear not only the need to not cut funding, but to make greater investments in these programs when he wrote, just a few months ago, “there are millions on treatment who cannot be abandoned. And the progress in many African nations depends on the realistic hope of new patients gaining access to treatment. . . . On AIDS, to stand still is to lose ground.”

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the most obvious and damaging implications of reducing the international affairs budget to 2008 levels. This resolution would set the stage for reckless cuts that endanger our national security, abandon our national interests and throw Americans out of work, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the debate on the reduction of non-defense and security spending, a visit to recent history reveals a telling connection between our soaring debt and the two wars our country is waging.

The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation estimates that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost the average American family of four almost \$13,000 last year. We know from our constituents when we return to our districts that the average American family of four cannot afford that. They cannot afford to pay for wars that undermine our national and moral security. Many families can barely afford to stay in their homes.

Nobel Prize winning economist and author of *The Three Trillion Dollar War*, Joseph Stiglitz, says that there is “no question that the Iraq war added substantially to the federal debt. This was the first time in American history that the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by borrowing. The global financial crisis, he says, was due at least in part to the war.”

If this sounds familiar, it is because we are pursuing the same policies today. The ramifications of our spending on the Iraq War—soaring oil prices, federal debt and a global economic crisis—were during a time when the resources dedicated to Iraq were much greater than those being dedicated to Afghanistan. The commitment of an additional 30,000 troops and a continually slipping withdrawal date commits us to an endless war and an endless stream of borrowed money. It commits us to seemingly endless economic insecurity.

Moving past the costs of waging war, there are the costs of providing returning veterans with the care they need. When these costs are factored in, the costs of health care and benefits for veterans significantly increases the \$3 trillion price tag to nearly \$5 trillion.

It is time to question the way we enhance our national security and our economic secu-

urity. It will be a grave mistake to miss this opportunity.

The facts tell us that the policies we have been pursuing in recent years have led us further from the very goals we claim to be working toward. The facts tell us that it is fiscally irresponsible to continue defense spending at current rates.

By ignoring this responsibility—by pretending that it doesn’t exist—we fail to heed the lessons from our economic decline. The costs of maintaining the status quo are great. The moral and human costs are even greater.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

Strike the last sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; (2) an amendment if offered by Representative McGovern of Massachusetts or a designee to ensure that FBI Counterterrorism funding is considered security spending, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.”

(The information contained herein was provided by Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Repub-

lican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair until 6:30 p.m., a period not longer than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MACK) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 43, by the yeas and nays; adoption of House Resolution 43, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

# PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 38, REDUCING NON-SECURITY SPENDING TO FISCAL YEAR 2008 LEVELS OR LESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 43) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 38) to reduce spending through a transition to non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 174, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

## YEAS—238

Adams	Dent	Hunter
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Issa
Akin	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins
Alexander	Dold	Johnson (IL)
Altmire	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (OH)
Amash	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Austria	Duffy	Jones
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Bachus	Ellmers	Kelly
Barletta	Farenthold	King (IA)
Bartlett	Fincher	King (NY)
Barton (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Kingston
Bass (NH)	Flake	Kinzinger (IL)
Benishek	Fleischmann	Kissell
Berg	Fleming	Kline
Biggert	Flores	Labrador
Bilbray	Forbes	Lamborn
Billirakis	Fortenberry	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Landry
Black	Franks (AZ)	Lankford
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Bonner	Galleghy	LaTourette
Bono Mack	Gardner	Latta
Boren	Garrett	Lee (NY)
Boustany	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Brooks	Gibson	Long
Broun (GA)	Gohmert	Lucas
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Bucshon	Gosar	Lummis
Buerkle	Gowdy	Lungren, Daniel
Burgess	Graves (GA)	E.
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	Mack
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	Manzullo
Camp	Griffith (VA)	Marchant
Campbell	Grimm	Marino
Canseco	Guinta	Matheson
Cantor	Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)
Capito	Hall	McCauley
Carter	Hanna	McClintock
Cassidy	Harper	McCotter
Chabot	Harris	McHenry
Chaffetz	Hartzler	McKeon
Coble	Hastings (WA)	McKinley
Coffman (CO)	Hayworth	McMorris
Cole	Heck	Rodgers
Conaway	Heller	Meehan
Cravaack	Hensarling	Mica
Crawford	Herger	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Culberson	Huelskamp	Miller, Gary
Davis (KY)	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney
Denham	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)

Myrick	Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Neugebauer	Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)
Noem	Rogers (KY)	Southerland
Nugent	Rogers (MI)	Stearns
Nunes	Rohrabacher	Stivers
Nunnelee	Rokita	Stutzman
Olson	Rooney	Sullivan
Palazzo	Roskam	Terry
Paul	Ross (AR)	Thompson (PA)
Paulsen	Ross (FL)	Thornberry
Pearce	Royce	Tipton
Pence	Runyan	Turner
Petri	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Pitts	Scalise	Walberg
Platts	Schilling	Walden
Poe (TX)	Schmidt	Walsh (IL)
Pompeo	Schock	Webster
Posey	Schweikert	West
Price (GA)	Scott (SC)	Whitfield
Quayle	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Rehberg	Sessions	Womack
Reichert	Shimkus	Woodall
Renacci	Shuster	Yoder
Ribble	Simpson	Young (AK)
Rigell	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Rivera		Young (IN)

## NAYS—174

Ackerman	Fudge	Owens
Andrews	Garamendi	Pallone
Baca	Gonzalez	Pascarell
Baldwin	Green, Al	Pastor (AZ)
Barrow	Green, Gene	Payne
Bass (CA)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Becerra	Harman	Perlmutter
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Berman	Heinrich	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Polis
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Quigley
Boswell	Hirono	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Holden	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Holt	Reyes
Capps	Honda	Richardson
Capuano	Hoyer	Richmond
Cardoza	Inslee	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	(TX)	Sanchez, Linda
Chandler	Johnson (GA)	T.
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciulline	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schwartz
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Levin	Serrano
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Sewell
Cooper	Lipinski	Sherman
Costa	Loebach	Slaughter
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Courtney	Lowe	Stark
Critz	Lujan	Sutton
Crowley	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Cuellar	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Cummings	Markley	Tierney
Davis (CA)	Matsumi	Tonko
Davis (IL)	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
DeFazio	McCollum	Tsongas
DeGette	McDermott	Van Hollen
DeLauro	McGovern	Velázquez
Deutsch	McIntyre	Visclosky
Dicks	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Dingell	Meeks	Wasserman
Doggett	Michaud	Schultz
Doyle	Miller (NC)	Waters
Edwards	Miller, George	Watt
Ellison	Moore	Waxman
Engel	Moran	Weiner
Eshoo	Murphy (CT)	Welch
Farr	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fattah	Napolitano	Woolsey
Filner	Neal	Wu
Frank (MA)	Oliver	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—22

Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	Shuler
Butterfield	Hinchey	Sires
Duncan (SC)	Hurt	Smith (WA)
Emerson	Larsen (WA)	Tiberi
Giffords	Lee (CA)	Westmoreland
Gingrey (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Wittman
Granger	Ros-Lehtinen	
Grijalva	Rush	

□ 1853

Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Messrs. CARNEY, LARSON of Connecticut, BECERRA and CUMMINGS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BURTON of Indiana changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 240, noes 168, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

## AYES—240

Adams	Ellmers	Landry
Aderholt	Farenthold	Lankford
Akin	Fincher	Latham
Alexander	Fitzpatrick	LaTourette
Altmire	Flake	Latta
Amash	Fleischmann	Lee (NY)
Austria	Fleming	Lewis (CA)
Bachmann	Flores	LoBiondo
Bachus	Forbes	Long
Barletta	Fortenberry	Lucas
Bartlett	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Bass (NH)	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Benishek	Galleghy	E.
Berg	Gardner	Mack
Biggert	Garrett	Manzullo
Bilbray	Gerlach	Marchant
Billirakis	Gibbs	Marino
Bishop (UT)	Gibson	Matheson
Black	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Blackburn	Goodlatte	McCaul
Bonner	Gosar	McClintock
Bono Mack	Gowdy	McCotter
Boren	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Boustany	Graves (MO)	McKeon
Brady (TX)	Griffin (AR)	McKinley
Brooks	Griffith (VA)	McMorris
Broun (GA)	Grimm	Rodgers
Buchanan	Guinta	Meehan
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mica
Buerkle	Hall	Miller (FL)
Burgess	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Burton (IN)	Harper	Miller, Gary
Calvert	Harris	Mulvaney
Camp	Hartzler	Murphy (PA)
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Canseco	Hayworth	Neugebauer
Cantor	Heck	Noem
Capito	Heller	Nugent
Carter	Hensarling	Nunes
Cassidy	Herger	Nunnelee
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Olson
Chaffetz	Huelskamp	Palazzo
Coble	Huizenga (MI)	Paul
Coffman (CO)	Hultgren	Paulsen
Cole	Hunter	Pearce
Conaway	Issa	Pence
Cravaack	Jenkins	Petri
Crawford	Johnson (IL)	Pitts
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Platts
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Davis (KY)	Jones	Pompeo
Denham	Jordan	Posey
	Kelly	Price (GA)
	King (IA)	Quayle
	King (NY)	Reed
	Kingston	Rehberg
	Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert
	Dold	Renacci
	Donnelly (IN)	Ribble
	Dreier	Rigell
	Duffy	Rivera
	Duncan (TN)	Roby